

**REMARKS**

Applicant thanks Examiner Gellner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 7 and 8.

The non-elected claims are canceled herein.

The Examiner has objected to the disclosure for an informality in the "CROSS REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS" section. Correction is made herein.

The Examiner has objected to Claims 3, 5, 7, and 9 for informalities in the language. Claims 3 and 5 are canceled herein. Claim 7 is amended to reduce ambiguity, albeit in a manner different than suggested by Examiner. It is asserted that the claim is clear as amended, such that claims 7 and 8 are now in condition for allowance. It is further asserted that the objection to claim 9 was in error. Examiner identified no specific language as being objectionable in claim 9, and claim 9 does not contain the objectionable language identified in claims 3, 5, and 7. It is therefore requested that the objection to claim 9 be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 5 and 6 are canceled herein, thereby rendering the rejection moot.

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 5, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jackson Jr. Claims 3 and 5 are canceled herein, thereby rendering the rejection moot as to those claims. With respect to claim 9, Applicant traverses. While the other rejected claims included selection of the nitrogen-containing compound from groups (a) and (b), Claim 9 includes selection of the nitrogen-containing compound from group (a), namely tetrazoles and tetrazole derivatives of the specified formulas. Examiner cites to the disclosure in Jackson Jr. of a cyanuric acid amide salt, which is not a tetrazole or derivative thereof. Rather, cyanuric acid amide salt falls under category (b)(B) in claims 3 and 5, namely a triazine derivative salt. Applicant finds no teaching or suggestion by Jackson Jr. of a propellant composition consisting essentially of a tetrazole or tetrazole derivative of the formulae IA or IB and an oxidizing agent that is an inorganic peroxide alone or in mixture with a nitrate. Therefore, claim 9 is not

Application No. 10/749,504  
Response dated June 21, 2006  
to Office Action mailed March 21, 2006

anticipated by Jackson Jr., and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claims 4, 6, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jackson Jr. Claims 4 and 6 are canceled herein, thereby rendering the rejection moot as to those claims. With respect to claim 10, Applicant traverses for at least the same reasons as provided above for claim 9, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

New claims 11 and 12 are added, and are directed to the elected species. The new claims depend from claim 9 and are believed to be allowed for at least the same reasons as provided for claim 9. In addition, Jackson Jr. does not disclose the specific compounds set forth in new claims 11 and 12.

In view of the foregoing amendments to the claims and remarks given herein, Applicants believe this case is in condition for allowance and respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes any detailed language of the claims requires further discussion, the Examiner is respectfully asked to telephone the undersigned attorney so that the matter may be promptly resolved. The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is appreciated.

Applicants are of the opinion that no additional fee is due as a result of this Amendment. If any charges or credits are necessary to complete this communication, please apply them to Deposit Account No. 23-3000.

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS LLP.

By: /Kristi L. Davidson/  
Kristi L. Davidson, Reg. No. 44,643

2700 Carew Tower  
441 Vine Street  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
513/241-2324 (voice)  
513/241-6234 (facsimile)  
K:\SSIT\099\response to 012606 OA.doc